

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

No. 6:23-cv-00353

Jay Williams,
Plaintiff,

v.

Unknown,
Defendant.


ORDER

Plaintiff Jay Williams, proceeding pro se, filed the above-styled and numbered civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell, who issued a report and recommendation (Doc. 3) concluding that plaintiff's complaint should be dismissed with prejudice for purposes of *in forma pauperis* proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Plaintiff filed objections. Doc. 4.

The court reviews the objected-to portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation de novo. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In his objections, plaintiff requests the disqualification and removal of Judge Mitchell from his case. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings, conclusions, or recommendations *in the report* to which he objects and the basis for his objections. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404, 410 n.8 (5th Cir. 1982) (en banc). Plaintiff's objections are not specific to the report.

Having reviewed the magistrate judge's report, and being satisfied that it contains no clear error, the court accepts its findings and recommendation. Doc. 3. For the reasons stated in the report, plaintiff's complaint is dismissed with prejudice for purposes of *in forma pauperis* proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Plaintiff may resume his lawsuit if he pays the entire filing fee of \$402 within thirty days after the entry of the final judgment.

So ordered by the court on December 19, 2023.



J. CAMPBELL BARKER
United States District Judge